

# THE NEW-YORK CITY-HALL RECORDER.

VOL. VI.

July, 1821.

NO. 6.

At a COURT of GENERAL SESSIONS of the Peace, holden in and for the City and County of New-York, at the City-Hall of the said City, on *Monday*, the 2d of *July*, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred twenty-one.

## PRESENT.

The Honourable

RICHARD RIKER, *Recorder*.

JOHN BINGHAM, and } *Aldermen*.

ROBERT McQUEEN, }

HUGH MAXWELL, *Dist. Att.*

RICHARD HATFIELD, *Clerk*.

COUNTERFEITING—PASSING—HAVING IN POSSESSION WITH AN INTENTION TO PASS.

HANNAH CONNER, alias HANNAH CURRAN'S Case.

MAXWELL, PRICE, and DAVID GRAHAM, *Counsel for the prosecution*.

McEWEN, *Counsel for the prisoner*.

Where one suspected at the police of being engaged in counterfeiting, for the purpose of taking away the odium, or for any other corrupt motive, puts in the possession of another person counterfeit money and immediately conveys intelligence to the police in consequence of which the person thus possessed of such counterfeit money is arrested and found in possession of it; it was held that the jury might infer from the circumstances that the person so delivering the counterfeit money to the other, had it in his or her possession, at a time anterior, with an intention of passing it.

If the facts upon which this prosecution was sustained be entirely true, the prisoner was guilty of an act of as consummate baseness as ever disgraced human nature. But there is just reason to suspect a part, though every one will say the conviction was just.

The prisoner was indicted for having in her possession, with an intention of uttering, one \$5 bill of the Suffolk Bank and two \$2 bills on the Bank of New-York, with an intention of defrauding

some person or persons to the jurors unknown, on the 16th of June last.

Maxwell opened the case to the jury, by stating in effect, that Bridget Murphy, a young woman recently married, having been arrested and confined in Bridewell on a charge for having these same notes in her possession, with an intention of uttering them, the grand jury proceeded to scrutinize the accusation, and finally directed a bill against the prisoner at the bar. The fact was, that the character of the prisoner being notorious in the police for being engaged in counterfeiting, for the purpose of averting that odium, or perhaps instigated by some other unworthy motive, she contrived to slip a quantity of this spurious money into the possession of Bridget Murphy, an ignorant and unsuspecting woman, directing her to keep it a short time, and then went immediately to the police and gave information, and the officers proceeded to the house of Bridget Murphy and found the roll of bills in her bosom. Thus the prisoner attempted to accomplish the ruin of an innocent woman; but, as sometimes occurs in the dispensations of an overruling providence, this base and wicked artifice has recoiled on the head of its contriver.

Bridget Murphy, sworn, testified that she was nineteen years old, and the wife of James Murphy. She became acquainted with the prisoner about a month ago, through one Christopher Curran, who says he is married to her, though she denies it. She had endeavoured to engage the witness to become concerned in passing counterfeit money, and had offered to let her have it at the rate of \$30 for \$100; saying that she soon expected her son Timothy from Canada, where she had sent him for counterfeit bills, when she should do well enough; but the husband of the witness had told her that if she had any thing to say to the prisoner he would break her neck.

On the 16th of June, at ten or eleven o'clock in the forenoon, the prisoner

came, in a carriage, to her house at No. 18 Banker-street, apparently in a great hurry, and in a low tone of voice, said she was then going down to the Hall to see about two of her sons, who were in trouble, and requested the witness to keep for her a small roll or bundle until she returned; for that the man to whom she was to have given it was not at home.— Mary Harvey was then in the room. The witness not examining the roll and not knowing what it contained, slipped it into her bosom; and in about fifteen minutes, Hays, Cornwell and other officers entered and searched her and took it out of her possession.

On her cross-examination she stated that when the officers came there she was in the yard: that Hays said to her, "What is that you have in your bosom?" But that she had not time enough to speak before he seized her and took the roll out of her bosom, near the left side, but *not from under the arm.*

Josiah Hedding, one of the police magistrates, being sworn, testified that he had known the prisoner ever since he was engaged in the police department, which was eight years; and was acquainted with the circumstances touching the arrest and examination of Bridget Murphy. She was brought up on the 16th of June on a charge of having counterfeit money in her possession; and from her story, which she related as she has here, and from other facts, he was induced to believe what she said to be true. And on an inquiry put by the counsel for the prisoner, the witness answered that he believed that ninety-nine counterfeit bills out of a hundred now in circulation in this city came through the hands of the prisoner; and that her character is notoriously bad.

Thomas Cornwell, a police officer, testified that, on the 16th of June, Hays asked Curtis and himself to take a walk, and on the way told them to be careful in seeing that the person they were to see threw nothing from her bosom. They went to the house of Bridget Murphy, who was in the cellar kitchen, and was called up in the room where the officers were; and as soon as she saw Hays, she put her hand up to her bosom, when he asked her what she had there, and was

about introducing his hand into her bosom when she said, "It is not here: it is down in the kitchen." He then went down there, and the witness proceeded to search her person, and took *from under her arm-pit* a roll of counterfeit bills, of various denominations, amounting to about \$ 50, among which were those laid in the indictment. These were new paper and merely rolled together without a wrapper. When the money was taken from her possession, she said she found it in the yard; but on her way to the police, she said that the prisoner gave it to her.

The prosecution having rested, the counsel for the prisoner urged to the court that there was not sufficient evidence to support the case, inasmuch as the prisoner did not, according to the testimony, have the notes in her possession with an intent to pass them, but with an intent to entrap Bridget Murphy and render her amenable to punishment.

Price said that he intended to put the case to the jury in this point of view: that anterior to the time the prisoner put the bills into the hands of Bridget Murphy, she intended to pass them; and from the testimony already given, and that which he intended to introduce, he hoped to be able to show that such was her intention.

The Recorder said that there was no doubt, if the jury should believe that the prisoner had these notes in her possession with no other intention but that of entrapping Bridget Murphy, this prosecution could not be sustained; but there is other evidence from which some other intent may be inferred, and the case ought to go to the jury.

McEwen opened the defence, which he placed principally on the ground that Bridget Murphy was not entitled to credit.

Jacob Hays, sworn on the part of the prisoner, confirmed the testimony of Cornwell with regard to the officers going to the house of Bridget Murphy. The witness further stated that, in the early part of the last Sessions, Christopher Curran, before named, informed him that he knew a young woman who had counterfeit money, which she generally carried in her bosom; and on the morning of the last day of the same term, when prisoners are sentenced, at about ten

o'clock, Henry Conner, son of the prisoner, being to be sentenced the same day with his brother James, for an assault and battery committed by them on the same Curran, informed the witness that in a house in Bancker-street, having a spring in the cellar, there was \$ 50 in counterfeit money which had been found in the yard and buried in the cellar; for that he had stood on the other side of the street and saw some person scratching in the dirt where the money was buried.— The witness then went with Cornwell and Curtis as before related; and on the way to the police, Bridget Murphy said, "They cannot hurt me, for I have not passed any of the money." The witness told her that they could, and instanced the case of Elizabeth Conner, who was convicted and sentenced for life, though she had not passed any counterfeit money; and he then told Mrs. Murphy that she had better tell where she procured that roll of bills; and she then said she got it from the prisoner.

The witness on his cross-examination testified that the character of the prisoner for dealing in counterfeit money was notorious: that he had taken it from her person; and that she had frequently been indicted, and once, at least, convicted, for the same offence.

Zebulon Homan, a police officer, on being sworn, testified that after Bridget Murphy was brought to the police office, he went to her house; and, on digging in the cellar, found a box containing \$45 or \$ 50 in counterfeit money; but it further appeared that this was in a part of the cellar which could not be seen by any one on the opposite side of the street; and it further appeared that there were other tenants in the same house.

Mary Harvey, sworn on the part of the prosecution, testified that she was present when the prisoner came to the house of Bridget Murphy, in a carriage; and the witness heard her speak in a low tone of voice to Mrs. Murphy, and tell her that she was going to the City-Hall on some business, and wished her to keep the small bundle, which she delivered, till she returned.

On her cross-examination, the witness stated that she was an acquaintance of Bridget Murphy, and was then in search

of a room, as the tenants of the house where she resided, in Oliver-street, were disorderly. She did not remain till the officers came.

The cause was summed up at length by the respective counsel, those on behalf of the prisoner urging to the jury, from a variety of considerations, that Bridget Murphy was not entitled to credit.

The Recorder, in his charge, brought to the view of the jury the prominent facts, and charged them that the guilt or innocence of the prisoner depended on the credit to be attached to the testimony of Bridget Murphy, which, corroborated as it was, he thought entitled to full credit. He charged the jury strongly against the prisoner, and left the case to their determination.

She was convicted, and on the last day in the term, after an impressive address from the Recorder, sentenced to the state prison for life.

There was one subject upon which the Recorder expatiated in pronouncing sentence which will be noticed. Soon after the death of John Conner, who was then under a charge of counterfeiting, the prisoner, a woman of sixty, formed such an intimacy with Curran, before named, a man about thirty years old, as excited the resentment of her two sons, James and Henry, who combined together and committed an outrageous assault and battery on him. The prisoner was instrumental in their prosecution; and the last day of the last term they were sentenced to the Penitentiary. This circumstance, perhaps, furnishes a clue to her conduct in putting the counterfeit money in the hands of Bridget Murphy. The prisoner prosecuted; but when her sons were about to be punished, her parental feelings prevailed over her resentment; and she, no doubt, imparted to them the information by a disclosure of which to the police she hoped that their punishment would be mitigated.

There can be no doubt but that this Bridget Murphy had been seduced into this business by Curran and the prisoner, and had proceeded farther than she testified on the trial; but her statement, in the most material parts, appeared to be supported by testimony, and the circumstances of the case; and no doubt the conviction was just.



## CIVIL CONTROVERSY CARRIED INTO A CRIMINAL COURT.

## GEORGE COOPER'S CASE.

MAXWELL and PRICE *counsel for the prosecution.*

CAINES and J. B. YATES, *Counsel for the defendant.*

A minute detail of the facts in this case would be of no public interest. A view of it will be given in as few words as possible. It appeared to be a matter which is, or ought to be, cognizable in a civil tribunal only, brought into a criminal court.

The parties, prosecutor and defendant, were Englishmen; and so were the principal witnesses. The defendant was indicted for grand larceny in stealing \$100 in silver and \$50 in paper, the property of James Day, from whose testimony and that of others it appeared that he, being acquainted with the business of tile and brick making, and being out of funds, had endeavoured to engage some gentleman of his country, of capital, to embark in the business; and after having induced one William Fitzgerald to join him, and the concern having broken off, he entered into partnership with Thomas Hudson; and it was agreed between them that Hudson should in the first instance advance the funds, and Day the labour and board the labourers; and that the business should be carried on at Tarrytown, whither Day and his family went. Day's wife was to have a stipulated sum a month. Previous to this arrangement between Day and Hudson, the defendant had been applied to by the former to enter into the concern, and had agreed to advance moneys, and did, in the first instance, advance moneys individually to Day and to the concern, to the amount of about \$400; and when the arrangement took place between Day and Hudson, the former gave his promissory note for \$203 to Hudson, which was endorsed by him to the defendant for the balance of what he had advanced; but it seems that the defendant still continued interested in the concern.

According to the statement of Day, his wife had brought out from England the cash in question, which she obtained from her friends there, but concealed the fact from him until a short time before it was taken in the manner hereafter stated:

that there was a gentleman in New-York, Edward Sturman, who was from England, with whom he became acquainted shortly after his arrival here; and considering the sum of money unsafe in the hut occupied at Tarrytown, it was determined to bring it to New-York, and leave it with Sturman, for safe keeping.

Hudson, living in the Bowery, came up to Tarrytown to see about the business, when it was agreed that both parties should come down to New-York together the next day; and they did so. Day took the box containing the money and put it into a basket and they set out together. According to his testimony, Hudson knew that the wife had this money and offered to borrow it, offering security as good as the Bank of England. They stopped at West-Farms, and again at a tavern about a mile from New-York called Robin Hood's, when the defendant came in. They went from there to the house of Hudson, who keeps a porter-house in the Bowery, where, in the course of the evening, there were Hudson and wife, the defendant, Mr. Hazleton and Orton, and one Akroyd and wife. After they had staid there till about eleven o'clock in the evening, Hudson beckoned Day to the front door, and when he turned round, all the company was gone except Mrs. Hudson and Mrs. Akroyd. Day went to take his basket, which he had kept near him during the evening, and was about departing, when he found the box gone. He then made an outcry, ran down the Bowery and got a watchman, and shortly met the defendant, in company with Orton, having in his possession the box of money, which was taken out of his possession, and he and his companion were carried to the watch-house.

The story on the other side was that the defendant had advanced the money aforesaid; and it was found that the business was so conducted by Day that both the defendant and Hudson would inevitably be the losers; and for that reason the latter went up to Tarrytown to make some arrangement for a separation. That it was apprehended by them that Day had been getting into his hands all the funds of the concern, and was about going back to England. That when they arrived at Hudson's, Day delivered him the basket

to take care of; and that while he had gone out into the back yard, Hudson, having his suspicions excited, opened the basket, took out the box, and said to Cooper, "See where our money has gone! Here is the money, or a part of it, which you have advanced for the concern. Keep it till to-morrow, when there shall be a final settlement." And that the defendant reluctantly accepted it, and carried it away as before related. This account appeared to be fully supported, by the testimony of every person present during the evening before named; and after the production of the principal testimony, the defendant called on the Rev. George Upfold, Rector of St. Luke's, in this city, Mr. Yates, his counsel, and a great number of witnesses, who concurred in showing that he formerly resided in Schenectady, and sustained an unblemished character.—The character of Day, also, appeared to be well supported by his brethren of the methodist church.

Such are the outlines of a case which occupied the court a whole day, until 11 in the evening.

The defendant was acquitted; but an arrangement was agreed on, by which the money was restored to Day.

#### CONSPIRACY—AGREEMENT TO DEFRAUD.

#### WILLIAM WARNER'S CASE,

*ind. with*

#### GEORGE S. ROSWELL.

MAXWELL, *counsel for the prosecution.*

WILKINS and BUNNER, *counsel for the defendant.*

In a prosecution for a conspiracy, the separate acts of the accused, indicating a confederacy, shall go to the jury; though there must be positive or circumstantial evidence sufficient to establish such confederacy.

The defendant was indicted with Roswell for conspiring with him to defraud Jonathan Goodhue of sixty pieces of silk handkerchiefs, of the value of \$300, on the 1st June last.

The amount of the testimony was, that on the last Tuesday of May, Roswell came into the store of Goodhue and inquired for fine silk handkerchiefs, and said something about Philadelphia; and subsequently Goodhue saw him at another store inquiring about bills of ex-

change on England. On the day laid in the indictment he came to the store and purchased the handkerchiefs for cash, directing them to be sent to 46 Wall-street. The goods were sent there by Morris Howard, a clerk of Goodhue, with directions to get the money. It appeared that soon after they were carried there, they were disposed of by Roswell to Warner, who paid him \$210 at one of the banks. While the clerk was after Goodhue for payment, this negotiation for the sale of the goods and payment was taking place between Warner and Roswell, the latter of whom obtained the goods of Goodhue and sold them for cash, and was so adroit in management as to deprive the owner of the goods, and go off without payment.

The reason why Warner was supposed to be implicated in the cheat appeared to be from the whispering which took place between himself and Roswell in the bank, and from his saying, when called on by Goodhue, that this Roswell was a merchant of Philadelphia; whereas it appeared in the progress of the trial that he was an accomplished swindler.—And it further appeared that when Warner was called on for the goods, he refused to deliver them unless Goodhue would advance \$210, the sum paid for them to Roswell. The circumstances of suspicion, however, against the defendant, appeared to be satisfactorily explained, and he produced testimony of an excellent character as a fair dealer.

When the testimony was first introduced on the part of the prosecution, the counsel for the defendant objected to evidence of the separate acts of either of the parties to charge the other, before first proving the confederacy. (2d Burr. 323, 4th Burr. 102-3.)

The Recorder pronounced the decision of the court, that it was competent for the public prosecutor to prove the separate acts of the parties indicative of a confederacy; though it would be incumbent on him, in the progress of the trial, to show, from positive or circumstantial testimony, facts from which a confederacy may be rationally inferred.

The prosecution was abandoned and the defendant was acquitted.

LARCENY—BAREFACED PROFLIGACY.

### DAVID BARTRON'S CASE.

MAXWELL, *counsel for the prosecution.*

PRICE and FAY, *counsel for the prisoner.*

The felonious intent is derived from the act; and when one comes, as the pretended agent of another, and inquires of another, having charge of a quantity of iron for sale, the price, and whether the pretended principal can have a specific quantity, and is informed that he can have such quantity at a certain price; but without further conversation, such agent takes away the iron secretly and converts it to his own use; it was held that he was guilty of a felonious taking.

A large quantity of heavy property in a ship was sold by one having charge of it; and the understanding between the vendor and vendee was, that when the property was delivered the payment should be made. The property was discharged from the vessel, as preparatory to delivery, and put on the wharf, and while there, a part was stolen; it was held that the ownership of the property was properly laid in the vendor.

This was a case of bold and daring depravity seldom equalled. The prisoner, heretofore a tenant of the state prison, was indicted for grand larceny in stealing five tons of pig iron, of the value of \$200, the property of *Charles Green*, on the 1st of May last.

Green, on being sworn, testified that he was the consignee of a cargo of pig iron, from Messrs. Hartford and Wesner, of Bristol, which came on board a ship to this city. The prisoner, on the 30th of April, came on board the vessel, which lay near Burling-slip, on the East River side, and pretending to have come from Messrs. Allaire & Co. iron-founders, (who carry on that business on a large scale at Corlier's Hook, more than a mile from the place,) inquired of the witness whether they could have twenty tons; and the witness replied that he thought they could have that quantity. Previous to this time, Messrs. McQueen & Co. had purchased the cargo; that is, they were to pay for it when discharged, weighed, and delivered. After the prisoner came on board, as from Allaire & Co., Green went to McQueen & Co. and obtained their assent to his disposing of 20 tons; and shortly after this, Joseph Curtis, one of the firm of Allaire & Co. came on board the ship and told Green that he had

received a message from him. Green was somewhat surprized at this, not having sent any message, but did not mention to Curtis the circumstance of the negotiation with the prisoner, but told him that they could have the twenty tons of iron; but Curtis said they did not want it. For this reason McQueen & Co. were to have the whole; and the iron was discharged on the wharf opposite Peter Remsen's store, in South-street, but when weighed it was found deficient in quantity, between five and six tons.

Bela Tiffany testified that, on the 30th of April, he was walking along South-street with a friend who wished to purchase pig iron, and seeing a quantity there, they were looking at it when the prisoner came up and introduced himself by saying that he had an uncle named Thomas Williams, who was concerned with him in a sloop, and that they had purchased five tons of iron out of the same vessel for the purpose of trimming their sloop, and that he would dispose of the iron.—The gentleman who wanted to purchase was about going away in the steam-boat, and the witness gave the prisoner his address in Pearl-street, and told him that if he would call there, he would treat with him for the iron. Accordingly he came, and the witness offered him \$40 a ton, which he accepted; and on the delivery of the iron on board a Rhode-Island vessel, (to which place it was sent,) the witness gave the prisoner a check on the bank for \$215, the amount of the iron.

Reuben Wright testified that he was one of the city weighers, and that the prisoner brought the iron from Burling-slip to Crane-wharf in a small craft, said to belong to himself and his brother, and, being apparently in a great hurry, applied to the witness to weigh it for Thomas Williams, which was done, and the bill made out in his name; but the prisoner went off without paying the fees.

He was arrested by George B. Raymond, to whom he stated that he had purchased the iron of Green; and in his examination he gives the same account.

Joseph Curtis stated that the firm of Allaire & Co. never employed the prisoner to negotiate for iron or to purchase it; though he had been employed in trans-



porting iron for them. He told the witness that Green had some iron for sale, to whom the witness applied and found the price was too high.

Price raised a question of law, whether as the iron was sold to McQueen & Co. the ownership ought not to have been laid in the partners constituting the firm, instead of Green.

This witness was then again called, and testified that the iron was bargained for to that firm to be paid for in a year; and the purchase was not considered complete until the delivery; so that if by accident it had been lost (as a part was) before delivery, the loss was his own.

Alderman McQueen, from the bench, confirmed this statement.

The cause was summed up by the respective counsel. Those for the prisoner urged to the jury that there was not sufficient evidence to show that the prisoner took this iron with a felonious intent. He intended to pay for it after he received the avails. It was a mere trespass.

The Recorder charged the jury, that in cases of this kind the intent is deducible from the act. There was nothing which occurred in the negotiation with Green which could induce a belief in the mind of the prisoner that he had a right to take the iron by virtue of a purchase; and we find him afterwards, in disposing of the property and in getting it weighed, resorting to falsehood. This is a pretty sure characteristic of guilt. Should the jury, from all the facts, believe that he took away the iron, without the consent of the owner, with an intent to convert it to his own use, it will be their duty to convict him. How he took it away does not appear, though the fact is clearly established.

The jury convicted him, and, on the last day in term, he was sentenced to the State Prison seven years.

#### SUMMARY FOR JULY, 1821.

##### MANSLAUGHTER.

*Mary Borden*, a black, was indicted, tried and convicted of this crime, in killing her own child with a sharp pointed

knife, which she threw at it in a fit of passion. She was sentenced to the State Prison four years.

##### FORGERY AND COUNTERFEITING.

*Robert Ferguson*, was indicted, tried and convicted of this offence in passing counterfeit notes on the Montreal Bank, the sum in which bills is expressed to be payable "*out of the joint funds of the association and no other.*" A question of law was raised by the prisoner's counsel, whether this was a negotiable note under the statute; and the question was reserved to be argued in arrest of judgment; and, for that purpose, sentence was suspended.

*Thomas Ireland*, was indicted, tried and convicted of this offence, in having in his possession, with an intention of passing, a \$5 counterfeit bill of the State Bank at Albany, and was sentenced to the State Prison seven years. The prisoner had been engaged in the business of bringing wood from Egg-Harbour in a small craft which came in on the East River side, about a mile from Pike-street. On the 18th of May, he met John Ball, one of the marshalls of the city, residing near the head of that street, and presented him with the bill, and inquired of him whether it was good. Ball said he thought not, but that Mr. Lounsberry was a judge; and at the same time, pointed to the store with a sign over the door, in Division-street, directly opposite the head of Pike-street. The prisoner then went up the street, and when he reached its head and was coming into Division-street, he turned to go in a different direction; but turning round and seeing Ball looking at him and pointing towards the store, he then entered it, and Ball soon after entered behind him and heard him asking the price of calico; and it was not until he saw Ball that he showed the bill, and made the same inquiry of William Cox, the clerk, as he had previously made of Ball. The bill was soon ascertained to be bad, when Ball proceeded to search the prisoner, and found in the lining of his hat seven bills of the same description as that laid in the indictment, and two \$5 counterfeit bills on the New-Brunswick Bank. He was taken to the police; and, on looking on the

floor where he was searched, Cox found two other counterfeit bills. In accounting for the possession of the bills, the prisoner declared he obtained them from one Capt. Thirby for wood; but on an inquiry of him, made by the police officers, he denied that he ever let the prisoner have any bills; but it was satisfactorily ascertained, as the Recorder remarked in passing sentence, that this Thirby and the prisoner were concerned together in the business of counterfeiting.

*John Lash*, was indicted, tried and convicted of this offence in passing a \$2 counterfeit bill of the Bank of New-York. One Martin Vosburgh, from Rhinebeck in Dutchess county, where he had previously sustained a good character, as appeared on the trial, was arrested at the house of Hannah Conner for counterfeiting; and offering to bring out others, he gave information against the prisoner, and on his trial testified that he received the bill from him as a counterfeit one, and if he, Vosburgh, passed it, he was to have fifty cents. It had been suggested to the witness, Vosburgh, that the prisoner was a very cunning man; and the witness by this means was induced to become concerned, and went with him to get \$100 in counterfeit notes of a man to whom he was to pawn his watch. The prisoner said they were as good as silver, and that he was to carry them up the North River to pass them round the country. These were the only facts. How little reliance can abandoned men place in the fidelity of their accomplices in guilt!

#### GRAND LARCENY.

*William Francis*, a black, pleaded guilty to an indictment for this offence in stealing two silver candlesticks, the property of William H. Shipman, and was sentenced to the State Prison five years.

*Edward Hamilton*, was indicted, tried, convicted and sentenced to the State Prison for the same period, for stealing a gold and a silver watch, the property of George Ledeman, on the 14th of June last. The property was stolen and advertised; the prisoner was brought to the watch-house with it in his possession; and

from thence to the police, where the owner obtained it.

*Solomon Henry*, indicted with Kane and Kelly, was tried for a burglary and grand larceny, in breaking and entering the dwelling-house of Elizabeth Peshine, 303 Pearl-street, on the night of the 10th of July, instant, and stealing sixty pair of buckskin shoes and six pair of black shoes, the property of Elizabeth Peshine, John Peshine, and Joseph Pettit; and he was convicted of the less offence, and sentenced to the State Prison five years. The store was broken open, and a trunk containing the shoes carried off, and was found shortly afterwards, by the owner and police officers, concealed in a dark room back of a grocery kept by the prisoner, at 4 James' Slip. Kelly occupied the upper part of the house, and, in conjunction with the prisoner, sent out one John Ramsey, an ignorant man, to dispose of the shoes; and this led to the detection. The trunk, when found, was broken in pieces, and thirty-eight pair of the shoes only reclaimed.

*Edmund Brown*, was indicted, tried and convicted of this offence, in stealing a trunk containing a silver watch, a ring, and cash, all amounting to more than \$25, the property, of Michael Daley, on the 3d of July; and he was sentenced to the State Prison four years. The owner lost the property and applied to Hays, who, the next day found the prisoner in one of the booths, and charged him with the theft, when he delivered up the watch, and told him where the trunk was, and it was found there.

#### PETIT LARCENY.

*George Johnson*, convicted of this offence on two indictments; *William Blake*, *James Campbell*, *William Martin*, *James H. Hamilton*, *William Smith*, *Daniel McCarty*, *Thomas Osborne*, *Mary Lattimore*, and *David McFadden*, were severally convicted of this offence, and the one first named was sentenced to the Penitentiary three years on each indictment, the two following three years each; the other five following, nine months each, and the remainder for shorter periods.